

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

BRADLEY J. HARRIS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 1:24-cv-00572-JPH-CSW
)	
JAMES STEVENS, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**ORDER DISMISSING ACTION AND
DIRECTING ENTRY OF FINAL JUDGMENT**

The Court's screening order at Docket No. 10 dismissed the operative complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. Plaintiff Bradley Harris was given a period of time in which to file a viable amended complaint or otherwise show cause why final judgment should not be entered. *See* dkt. 10 at 4. The Court also warned Mr. Harris that "[f]ailure to do so will result in the dismissal of this action for the reasons set forth in this Order." *Id.*

Mr. Harris has filed an amended complaint in response to the Court's Order. Dkt. 11. However, Mr. Harris's response fails to cure the deficiencies identified in the Court's order. Rather, he persists in seeking monetary damages and invalidation of the terms of his sentence and parole, which is barred by the doctrine recognized in *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994). The Court cannot discern any material differences between the allegations and relief sought in Mr. Harris' original and amended complaints.

For the same reasons stated in the Court's Screening Order, Mr. Harris' allegations are insufficient to state a claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1983. *See*

dkt. 10 at 2–4. Therefore, this action is **dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.** 28 U.S.C. § 1915A; *see also Childress v. Walker*, 787 F.3d 433, 441 (7th Cir. 2015); *Paul v. Marberry*, 658 F.3d 702, 705 (7th Cir. 2011). Final judgment shall now issue.

SO ORDERED.

Date: 11/13/2024



James Patrick Hanlon
United States District Judge
Southern District of Indiana

Distribution:

BRADLEY J. HARRIS
419 Commerce Road
Apt. 412
Richmond, IN 47374